

Response to Office Action of July 1, 2008
U.S. Application No. 10/789,296

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-11 and 31-38 are subject to the present Office Action mailed July 1, 2008. Claim 33 has been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In the interests of expediting the prosecution of the present application, Claim 33 has now been cancelled and its limitation added to Claim 31, while the remaining Claims 1-30 and 38 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to Applicants' pursuit of the subject matter of such claims in any later filed continuing applications. No new matter has been added by this Amendment.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3 – 6, and 9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Symons* (U.S. Patent No. 6,155,580) in view of *Harwood* (GB 2,116,490). Claim 10 additionally has been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Symons* in view of *Harwood* and *Myers* (U.S. Patent No. 5,002,292). Lastly, Claims 31, 32, 34, 35, 37 and 38 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Symons*, *Harwood* and *Myers*. Claim 36 has been rejected 35 USC § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Symons* in view of *Harwood*, *Myers* '051 and *Myers* '292.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 33 has been stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Claim 31, from which Claim 33 depends, has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 33, and Claim 33 has been canceled. Claims 31-32 and 34-37 are thus now believed to be allowable over the cited art of record.

IV. Response to Comments from Examiner

Applicants note the Examiner's comments regarding the prior amendment of Claim 1 including the limitations of Claim 2, and states that any omission from Claim 1 as amended, of

Response to Office Action of July 1, 2008
U.S. Application No. 10/789,296

language from Claim 2 was not intentional and was inadvertent. Additionally, while Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejections of Claims 1, 3-6, 9-11 and 38, in the interests of expediting the prosecution of this Application, Applicants have now cancelled Claims 1, 3-6, 9-11 and 38 without prejudice or disclaimer to Applicant's right to pursue the subject matter of such claims in any later filed continuing applications.

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application is in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the foregoing response, he is invited and urged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



D. Scott Sudderth
Reg. #34,026

9-29-08
Date

Customer No. 26158
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, Georgia 30357-0037
(404) 962-7527 (Telephone)
(404) 870-8177 (Facsimile)

Docket No.: R122 1020.2